DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 347 TM 003 953

AUTHOR Lunneborg, Patricia W.
TITLE Interpreting SCII Other-Sex Scores. Project No. 275.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Bureau of Testing.
REPORT NO FAC-P-275
PUB DATE Jul 74
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Correlation; *Interest Scales; Scores; *Sex Differences; *Test Interpretation; *Vocational Counseling; *Vocational Interests
IDENTIFIERS *Strong Campbell Interest Inventory; Strong Vocational Interest Blank

ABSTRACT

To further understanding of the meaning of other-sex scores on the New Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory, correlations of occupational scores on both forms of the old SVIB with masculinity were studied in a sample of 116 female counseling clients. Differences in mean scores for scales appearing on both forms were highly related to the masculinity of the people in those occupations compared to others of the same sex. Recommendations are included for using MF scores to guide clients faced with "very similar" scores on occupational tests normed on the other sex. Data tables describing correlation and intercorrelation among the scales are included. (Author/SE)

Bureau of Testing
University of Washington—Seattle

Educational Assessment Center

University of Washington

July 1974

Interpreting SCII Other-Sex Scores

Patricia W. Lunneborg

Abstract

To further understanding of the meaning of other-sex scores on the New Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory, correlations of occupational scores on both forms of the old SVIB with masculinity were studied in a sample of 116 female counseling clients. Differences in mean scores for scales appearing on both forms were highly related to the masculinity of the people in those occupations compared to others of the same sex. Recommendations are included for using MF scores to guide clients faced with "very similar" scores on occupational tests normed on the other sex.

Educational Assessment Center Project: 275

Interpreting SCII Other-Sex Scores

Patricia W. Lunneborg

The publication of the new Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory (SCII) raises a major problem of test interpretation which heretofore was limited to the few (?) college women whose counselors decided to administer both forms of the SVIB--the meaning of "other-sex" scores. Now with the SCII everyone gets everything. With respect to the 124 Occupational Scales both sexes receive standard scores on all scales whether "f" (normed on women) or "m" (normed on men). To emphasize Campbell's (1974) philosophy that scales developed on male samples work better for men and those developed on females work better for women, only same-sex scores are plotted graphically on the Profile sheet and other-sex scores appear in parentheses for additional deemphasis.

The counselor faces a quandary with respect to these other-sex scores for, as the Manual indicates, clients will often score higher on the other-sex scale of a pair of occupations, e.g., a sample of males had a higher mean on mathematician f than m, and females a higher mean on mathematician m than f (p. 74). If clients do as Campbell hopes and "ponder the similarity, or lack of it, between her/his interests and those of both men and women," it seems probable that they will ask what it means to have interests more like the other sex than their own.

Munley et al. (1973) who gave both Men's and Women's Forms of the SVIB to a sample of women taking introductory psychology noted differences in favor of the Men's Form for 13 of 21 common scales. They said that high other-sex scores indicated interests in common with the men in these occupations and the inference was that women should seriously consider such occupations even if they lacked interests in common with the women in them. But other-sex scores for women result simply from their affinity for items which separated a particular male occupational sample from men-in-general. Can it be assumed that high scoring women are really alike in interests to the men in that given occupation? Before clients make career choices based on other-sex scores, more needs to be known about just what such scores mean.

The pattern of mean differences among the common scales found by Munley et al. (1975) suggested a possibility. Where their general hypothesis of higher scores on the men's blank did not work at all, i.e., where there were .COI differences in the opposite direction, the occupations had decidedly masculine associations (at least up to the present time): Army Officer, Math-Science Teacher, Physical Therapist, Computer Programmer. And where their hypothesis had the strongest support, i.e., where the women scored much higher on the Men's Form, the occupations had feminine associations: Music Teacher, Librarian, Musician-Performer, Social Worker. Could it be that women are more like men in traditionally feminine occupations and more like women in occupations traditionally associated with men? Campbell (1974) looking at mean scores on the 29 "common" occupations in the SCII for men-in-general and women-in-general samples noted that means were to some extent a function of how much the scales were dominated by "male" and "female" items, that is, items showing large sex differences in popularity.

The present study sought to explore the hypothesis that differences between scores on the Men's and Women's Forms of the SVIB common scales are a function of the masculinity of these occupations as measured by the MFII and FMII scales (Campbell, 1971). If such a relationship between MF and Form differences could be found for the Munley et al. data as well as for data based on a sample of counseling clients, it would provide a starting point for client-counselor discussion of other-sex scores on the SCII, both for scales in common for the sexes and those unique to the other sex.

Method

The counseling sample consisted of all 116 women tested with both SVIB blanks (Forms T398 and T399) at the University of Washington's counseling center between August 1969 (when these forms were instituted) and April 1974. Intercorrelation of 115 variables (Homemaking, MFII, FM II, 21 Common scales on both forms, 37 Women's Unique scales, and 33 Men's Unique scales) and the t-tests of differences were performed using SPSS computer programs (Nie, Bent, and Hull, 1970). Four tables which include the most important of these over 6000 correlation coefficients appear at the end of this report.

Results

First, the 21 common scales investigated by Munley et al. were ranked according to the MFII mean scores of the men in these occupations. These scores were obtained from the Handbook (Campbell, 1971, p. 233 and 235). The MFII scale represents empirical sex differences on 32 SVIB items common to both forms with, for example, liking Golf weighted in the masculine direction, and liking Art weighted in the feminine direction. As can be seen from Column 1 in Table 1, the most masculine occupations, i.e., occupations in which the men got the highest MFII scores, were Army Officer, Accountant (CPA used as no Accountant score available), and Banker. The least masculine occupations were Music Teacher, Artist, and Librarian. Next, the 21 occupations were ranked in terms of the difference between the mean on the Women's Blank and Men's Blank found by Munley et al. (Column 2). For example, for Music Teacher the mean was 41.23 for the Men's Blank and 16.75 on the Women's Blank, which difference of -24.48 gave Music Teacher a rank of 21. The Spearman rho (rank-difference correlation) between these two rankings was .78, significant at the .01 level, indicating a positive relationship between obtaining higher scores on the Women's Blank and the "masculinity" of the occupation.

Column 3 in Table 1 presents the rankings of the 21 occupations for the counseling sample in the present study in terms of the difference between scores on the two forms (again, Women's mean minus Men's mean). The Spearman rho between this ranking and the occupations' MFII scores was .71, again significant at the .01 level. The two difference score rankings were correlated .90 (rho). The twelve scales in the present study with significantly higher scores on the Men's Blank were 12 of Munley's 13 significant scales. However, in contrast to the four scales cited above on which Munley's sample scored higher on the Women's Blank, in the counseling sample seven scales had significantly higher mean scores on the Women's Blank: Army Officer, Math-Science Teacher, YWCA-YMCA Staff Member, Accountant, Engineer, Physical Therapist, Banker-Bankwoman. (Additionally, Computer Programmer was in the same direction found by Munley et al., but significant at only the .08 level.)

Table 1

Common SVIB Scales Ranked According to Different Criteria

Occupation	(1) Handbook MFII Rank	(2) Munley et al. W - M Rank[1]	(3) Lunneborg W - M Rank[1]	(4) Handbook Homemaking Rank
Army-Officer	1.5	1	1	9
Accountant	1.5	8	3	3.5
Banker-Bankwoman	3	5	7	14
Math-Sci Teacher	4.5	3	4	12
Physical Therapist	4.5	4	6	18
Computer Programmer	6	2	8	11
Bus Ed Teacher	7	13	17	18
Soc Sci Teacher	8	9	9	16
Engineer	9	6	5	8
Dentist	10	10	10	7
Physician	11	11	11	3.5
Chemist	12	19	16	5.5
Lawyer	13	16	12	1
Psychologist	14	14	15	10
Social Worker	15	17	18	15
Mathematician	16	15	13	2
Y Staff Member	17	7	2	20
Musician Performer	18	18	20	18
Music Teacher	19	21	21	21
Artist	20	12	14	5.5
Librarian	21	20	19	13

[1] Women's mean minus men's mean.

One might expect on the basis of these results with the MFII scale that a ranking of the occupations in terms of the femininity (FMII scores) of the women in the occupations would result in a high negative correlation between occupational difference scores (W - M) and the "femininity" of the occupations. Again, using the Handbook (pages 233 and 235) which unfortunately does not include mean scores for women in Accountant, Banker, or Computer Programmer, a ranking of 18 occupations according to the FMII scores of women in them correlated only -.43 with W - M difference scores. While significant at the .05 level, this rho is appreciably less than that obtained using men's MFII scores.

Trying to explain the W - M difference scores in terms of the strength of correlation between the occupations and Homemaking (a Basic Interest Scale) resulted in a rho of .01. Column 4 of Table 1 presents the occupations' ranking in terms of Homemaking r's which ranged from .39 for Music Teacher to -.60 for the Lawyer Scale. Likewise, using the counseling sample data and computing rho between W - M differences and Homemaking r's for the occupations resulted in a rho of .07. These results reinforce the definition in the Handbook of the FMII scale as concerned with intellectual femininity (art, music, verbal activities) and not with domestic concerns.

Lastly, what was the relationship of difference scores between the two Blanks and the strength of the correlations of these occupations with FMII and MFII scores in the counseling sample itself? Table 2 presents these correlations. The rho's with the W - M ranking presented in Column 3 of Table 1 are as follows: for the 21 occupations as measured by the Women's Form, FMII rho = .65, MFII rho = .68; for the occupations as measured by the Men's Form, FMII rho = .76, MFII rho = .76. It is clear that a major contributor to the differences observed between the two forms of the SVIB for common occupations is the masculinity of the interests which differentiate people in these occupations from others of the same sex. With respect to the unique scales of the Women's and Men's Forms, then, MFII and FMII correlations might also be instructive in terms of counseling clients who will be receiving only other-sex scores. Table 3 presents these correlations for the SVIB.

Table 2

Masculinity, Femininity, and 21 SVIB Common Scale Correlations Among Women Counseling Clients (Decimal points omitted)

Scale	Women's Form SVIB		Men's Form SVIB	
	MFII	FMII	MFII	FMII
Music Teacher	-35	41	-39	37
Musician Performer	-52	57	-46	44
Artist	-41	45	-37	36
Y Staff Member	-03	14	08	-07
Social Science Teacher	-04	21	-04	04
Social Worker	-1?	23	-1[illegible]	23
Psychologist	-21	28	-22	28
Librarian	-37	52	-60	71
Physician	-08	14	-21	17
Dentist	13	-14	-09	-03
Chemist	04	-01	-07	02
Mathematician	-05	05	-28	27
Computer Programmer	31	-38	19	-20
Math-Science Teacher	40	-45	27	-32
Engineer	28	-26	11	-13
Army-Officer	26	-17	36	-36
Lawyer	02	10	-24	33
Accountant	35	-39	21	-21
Banker-Bankwoman	36	-41	27	-32
Business Ed Teacher	33	-39	24	-26
Physical Therapist	27	-24	08	-10

Table 3

Masculinity, Femininity and SVIB Unique Occupational Scale Correlations Among Women Counseling Clients

(Decimal points omitted)[1]

Women's Form Scales	MFII	FMII	Men's Form Scales	MFII	FMII
Entertainer	-35	34	Osteopath	-06	02
Model	-17	14	Veterinarian	22	-33
Art Teacher	-43	56	Psychiatrist*	-23	28
Interior Decorator	-39	46	Biologist*	-25	25
Newswoman	-38	49	Architect*	-34	31
English Teacher	-40	55	Physicist	-11	08
Language Teacher	-52	63	Production Manager	36	-42
Recreation Leader	06	-01	Air Force Officer	43	-42
Dir Christian Ed	-23	33	Carpenter	17	-22
Nun-Teacher	-05	07	Forest Service Man	22	-12
Guidance Counselor	-05	15	Farmer	17	-24
Speech Pathologist	-24	29	Printer	10	-17
Translator	-36	45	Policeman	24	-26
Medical Technologist*	25	-28	Personnel Director	08	03
Army - Enlisted*	53	-54	Public Admin	20	-10
Navy - Enlisted*	53	-66	Rehab Counselor	-06	18
Navy - Officer*	22	-21	School Supt	-19	22
Life Ins Underwriter	13	-09	Minister*	-52	58
Buyer*	27	-31	CPA Owner	02	02
Home Economics Teacher	-04	05	Senior CPA	37	-36
Dietitian	15	-10	Office Worker	29	-27
Physical Ed Teacher*	48	-54	Purchasing Agent	43	-51
Occupational Therapist	21	32	Pharmacist	30	-44
Public Health Nurse	-03	10	Funeral Director	12	-24
Registered Nurse	-04	09	Sales Manager	19	-20
Licensed Prac Nurse*	23	-25	Real Estate Sales	18	-17
Radiologic Technologist*	35	-39	Life Ins Salesman	-07	06
Dental Assistant*	36	-43	Advertising Man*	-33	35
Exec Housekeeper*	29	-24	Author-Journalist*	-47	51
Elementary Teacher	-03	07	President-Mfg	16	-19
Secretary	17	-19	Credit Manager	31	-29
Saleswoman*	26	-29	Cham. of Com Exec	06	-01
Telephone Operator	30	-34	Community Rec	12	-09
Instrument Assembler*	44	-56			
Sewing Mach Operator*	33	-42			
Beautician*	25	-42			
Airline Stewardess	06	-07			

[1] Asterisk indicates caution in recommending to other-sex client.

Discussion

As to what practical help these correlations of SVIB occupational scales with MFII and FMII scores might be to counselors interpreting other-sex SCII scores, consider first a female client confronted with "similar" or "very similar" scores on scales normed on men for occupations highly correlated with masculinity such as Banker, Army-Officer, Air Force Officer, or Pharmacist. There should be little ambiguity in recommending that she consider such occupations, as her interests are like those of the men in these occupations. Thus, in the present study, "safe" occupations on the Men's Form were Math-Science Teacher, Army-Officer, Accountant, Banker, and Business Education Teacher where MFII and FMII correlations indicated high masculinity.

Second, consider the woman who receives similar or very similar scores on "m" scales negatively correlated with masculinity, e.g., Music Teacher, Librarian, Architect, Author-Journalist. She should be cautious about accepting that she is like the men in these occupations. A high negative correlation with MFII means that one reason the men in a given occupation stand out from men-in-general is because they have many interests in common with women. A female client may thus achieve very similar scores on such "m" scales on the basis of having feminine interests in common with the men in that occupation, not so much because she shares particular occupational interests with them. It is precisely these Common Scales from the SVIB on which the counseling clients in the present study were observed to achieve higher scores on the Men's Form than the Women's Form--Musician-Performer, Librarian, Psychologist, Artist. These higher scores did not mean these women were more like the men in these occupations than the women in them. Higher scores on the Men's Form simply meant that what differentiated the men in these occupations from men-in-general were a lot of feminine intellectual interests. Thus, in the present study, "unsafe" occupations on the Men's Form include Music Teacher, Musician-Performer, Artist, Psychologist, Librarian, Mathematician, and Lawyer. Their MFII and FMII correlations indicated high femininity.

Lastly, what to tell the female client who scores similar or very similar on scales normed on men which are uncorrelated with MFII and FMII. In the present study these are the occupations in Table 2 which did not

have both MFII and FMII r's equal to or greater than |20|. Using this definition of no correlation, there were nine "neutral" occupations: Y Staff Member, Social Science Teacher, Social Worker, Dentist, Chemist, Engineer, Physical Therapist, Physician, and Computer Programmer. Such neutral occupations can be recommended for the female-client's consideration because her interest similarity to the men in these occupations is not based on traditional femininity of interests inasmuch as the distinguishing interests of these men from men-in-general were not popular feminine responses to SVIB items. And turning to the unique scales on the Men's Form of the SVIB, only those scales that are negatively correlated with masculinity need to be treated with caution with the female client--Psychiatrist, Biologist, Architect, Minister, Advertising Man, and Author-Journalist.

Extending these arguments to male clients faced with other-sex scores on the SCII, practically counselors need MFII and FMII correlations with the female-normed occupations based on a male sample. In the absence of these data, however, using the data relating to the Women's Form in Table 2, counselors might urge caution when a male scores high on "f" scales for: Computer Programmer, Math-Science Teacher, Engineer, Army-Officer, Accountant, Bankwoman, Business Education Teacher, and Physical Therapist. From Table 3 looking at the Women's Unique Scales males should be wary about high scores on: Medical Technologist, Army-Enlisted, Navy-Enlisted, Navy-Officer, Buyer, Physical Education Teacher, Licensed Practical Nurse, Radiologic Technologist, Dental Assistant, Executive Housekeeper, Saleswoman, Telephone Operator, Instrument Assembler, Sewing Machine Operator, and Beautician. For the women in these occupations are partially distinguished from women-in-general by the masculinity of their interests. Men who get high scores on such "f" scales may share only this masculinity, not the crucial occupational interests which make for success and satisfaction in these areas. Again, however, MF correlations for a male sample are needed.

Among the ways in which the SCII has attempted to reduce the differential treatment of the sexes by the SVIB is the elimination of MFII and FMII scores. The usefulness of such MF measures has been severely called into question (e.g., Harmon, 1972) and the major criticism that

MF indices serve to perpetuate harmful sex-stereotypes in occupations is telling. But because the SCII continues to be based on sex differences (assembling occupational samples separately) the elimination of the MF score deserves reconsideration. It would appear to be needed by counselors to make sense out of other-sex scores, the complete meaning of which must remain debatable for some time. As Harmon has said, "If MF scales are used to label, to evaluate, or to create anxiety, their use is repressive; if they are used to foster exploration and self-acceptance their use can be liberating (1972, p. 3)." It is suggested that the musing and pondering over other-sex scores which, Campbell says, "is where societal change must start" would be more constructively handled by counselors who have MF scores for clients and MF correlational data for themselves.

References

Campbell, D. P. Handbook for the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1971.

Campbell, D. P. Manual for the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory T325 (Merged Form). Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Harmon, L. W. MF scales: instruments of male chauvinism or responsible tools of the psychologist? Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Meetings in Honolulu, September 1972.

Munley, P. H., Fretz, B. R., and Mills, D. H. Female college students' scores on the Men's and Women's Strong Vocational Interest Blanks. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 285-289.

Nie, N. H., Bent, D. H., and Hull, C. H. SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Table 4

Correlations Among 21 SVIB Common Scales from the Men's and Women's Forms[1]

	Music Teach	Music Perf	Artist	Y Staff	Soc Sci Teach	Soc Worker	Psychologist	Librarian	Physician	Dentist	Chemist	Mathematician	Computer Prog	Math-Sci Teach	Engineer	Army Officer	Lawyer	Accountant	Banker	Bus Ed Teach	Phys Therapist
Music Teach	56	57	20	41	29	10	-07	17	-38	-63	-53	-44	-64	-72	-69	-11	-02	-58	-38	-18	-56
Music Perf	23	61	45	16	02	-07	14	12	-09	-42	-32	-21	-33	-70	-53	-23	-10	-67	-69	-58	-39
Artist	-15	33	65	-24	-21	-26	24	15	21	01	05	23	-03	-32	-20	-34	-12	-40	-65	-60	-28
Y Staff	43	21	-26	62	35	29	-15	-17	-28	-51	-38	-52	-42	-37	-37	23	02	-39	-16	01	-02
Soc Sci Teach	39	06	-29	44	40	22	-39	-17	-62	-65	-70	-71	-63	-44	-66	-06	-08	-38	06	-30	-32
Soc Worker	55	44	-01	78	60	62	27	30	-05	-41	-19	-27	-50	-49	-34	37	33	-38	-28	-16	-14
Psychologist	16	33	39	36	35	45	80	65	57	27	53	55	11	-04	29	38	49	-00	-34	-40	02
Librarian	34	63	46	30	42	35	42	64	08	-29	-07	06	-34	-56	-30	11	36	-30	-39	-46	-44
Physician	-11	17	34	-11	-06	06	42	12	63	43	49	49	20	11	24	-07	01	-28	-55	-55	40
Dentist	-45	-16	17	-65	-48	-47	-08	-26	23	39	23	30	30	29	17	-44	-37	-08	-22	-22	26
Chemist	-37	-10	27	-45	-30	-22	42	16	64	70	72	73	62	50	60	-03	05	28	-07	-26	38
Mathematician	-10	07	39	-29	-11	-05	43	40	48	43	56	68	32	28	33	-13	10	14	-11	-24	05
Computer Prog	-19	-10	-02	02	-02	03	47	16	56	54	67	55	68	47	74	48	32	51	-13	-09	42
Math-Sci Teach	-28	-43	-42	-31	-24	-10	-01	-20	23	51	47	36	66	74	64	05	-15	43	39	28	61
Engineer	-45	-37	14	-55	-34	-21	22	12	49	71	66	69	60	65	68	-03	06	55	24	-02	32
Army Officer	-13	-23	-22	09	05	-02	15	-08	26	31	37	23	53	39	58	49	23	50	26	17	37
Lawyer	35	41	44	34	48	28	30	40	16	-20	-02	06	-39	-38	-26	16	45	-23	-33	-31	-32

Table 4 (continued)

Correlations Among 21 SVIB Common Scales from the Men's and Women's Forms[1]

	Music Teach	Music Perf	Artist	Y Staff	Soc Sci Teach	Soc Worker	Psychologist	Librarian	Physician	Dentist	Chemist	Mathematician	Computer Prog	Math-Sci Teach	Engineer	Army Officer	Lawyer	Accountant	Banker	Bus Ed Teach	Phys Therapist
Accountant	-24	-46	-45	-33	-20	-22	-35	-17	-22	14	03	-06	32	45	32	01	-07	63	75	56	14
Banker	-28	-54	-47	-38	-27	-34	-66	-48	-54	-10	-35	-36	03	30	-09	-27	-35	34	69	67	-04
Bus Ed Teach	13	-33	-59	21	13	05	-47	-31	-60	-35	-47	-58	-18	04	-22	06	-14	19	57	72	-08
Phys Therapist	05	-03	-32	17	-08	13	00	-30	22	20	19	-04	09	15	19	07	-25	-28	-20	-13	65

[1]Women's form on horizontal, men's form on vertical.

Table 5

Intercorrelations Among Men's Common Scales and Among the Women's Common Scales[1]

	Music Teach	Music Perf	Artist	Y Staff	Soc Sci Teach	Soc Worker	Psychologist	Librarian	Physician	Dentist	Chemist	Mathematician	Computer Prog	Math-Sci Teach	Engineer	Army Off	Lawyer	Accountant	Banker	Bus Ed Teach	Phys Ther
Music Teach		63	13	51	64	58	02	54	-19	-35	-59	-23	-50	-55	-75	-50	36	-47	-24	12	-09
Music Perf	60		65	16	17	28	19	58	27	14	-08	09	-28	-38	-42	-45	28	-63	-47	-40	02
Artist	03	53		-39	-33	-27	24	33	55	57	41	53	-20	-28	20	-43	27	-52	-37	-74	-18
Y Staff	66	42	-04		66	71	-12	08	-21	-57	-69	-67	-17	-28	-78	05	14	-29	-21	40	40
Soc Sci Teach	44	15	-02	62		55	-33	15	-49	-52	-84	-62	-62	-45	-80	-33	19	-10	20	62	-02
Soc Worker	44	24	-04	65	66		41	49	-05	-65	-51	-34	-07	-39	-68	-06	36	-43	-48	21	24
Psychologist	16	41	56	36	37	46		51	45	-11	39	50	44	03	15	06	26	-42	-70	-43	04
Librarian	27	45	55	27	46	53	74		07	-23	-08	23	-11	-39	-31	-37	44	-32	-49	-25	-22
Physician	-10	17	45	00	07	26	77	51		62	62	46	27	11	29	00	16	-54	-59	-73	46
Dentist	-37	-28	11	-31	-16	09	42	20	76		61	38	02	26	49	-12	-18	-10	01	-53	17
Chemist	-17	-07	21	-12	-02	21	64	40	88	82		73	57	44	80	26	-07	04	-26	-64	07
Mathematician	-22	-01	42	-25	-05	14	66	49	83	74	91		28	22	64	-14	22	-07	-23	-63	-32
Computer Prog	-53	-40	-16	-42	-30	-31	14	-14	33	51	53	49		56	44	70	-23	19	-30	-18	27
Math-Sci Teach	-42	-69	-45	-44	-19	-11	-08	-24	29	64	58	48	65		44	45	-57	35	09	00	30
Engineer	-32	-35	-07	-17	-07	11	43	20	69	83	85	73	71	71		25	-17	36	10	-40	-17
Army Officer	11	07	00	57	52	49	53	41	38	23	35	23	17	04	46		-27	31	-04	14	29
Lawyer	09	17	36	41	61	54	67	73	47	24	38	40	01	-10	34	75		-33	-30	-29	-38

Table 5 (continued)

Intercorrelations Among Men's Common Scales and Among the Women's Common Scales[1]

	Music Teach	Music Perf	Artist	Y Staff	Soc Sci Teach	Soc Worker	Psychologist	Librarian	Physician	Dentist	Chemist	Mathematician	Computer Prog	Math-Sci Teach	Engineer	Army Off	Lawyer	Accountant	Banker	Bus Ed Teach	Phys Ther
Accountant	-41	-49	-15	-25	-05	-05	11	13	22	48	42	42	56	60	68	44	40		67	45	-24
Banker	-23	-63	-67	-20	-05	-06	-40	-23	-34	09	-05	-11	30	57	25	09	-04	66		56	-31
Bus Ed Teach	01	-61	-71	-06	05	-08	-56	-40	-56	-12	-27	-33	05	45	-01	-08	-27	36	80		-02
Phys Therapist	-18	-37	-48	-10	-08	15	05	-29	43	58	53	-30	45	67	60	11	-17	12	16	68	

[1]Men's form in top half of matrix, women's form in bottom half.

Table 6

Correlations Among 33 Men's Unique Scales

	Osteopath	Veterinarian	Psychiatrist	Biologist	Architect	Physicist	Produc Mgr	Air Force Off	Carpenter	For Serv Man	Farmer	Printer	Policeman	Personnel Dir	Public Admin	Rehab Couns	School Supt	Minister	CPA Owner	Senior CPA	Office Worker	Purch Agent	Pharmacist	Funeral Dir	Sales Mgr	Real Est Sales
Osteopath		57	24	50	06	30	-03	11	14	54	31	-03	29	-39	-15	-13	-23	01	-32	-24	-39	-33	17	-19	-51	-4
Veterinarian			-35	07	06	04	16	-07	53	56	73	39	40	-54	-38	-48	-41	-38	-41	-09	-02	23	53	30	-11	0
Psychiatrist				60	00	27	-21	16	-56	-16	-53	-66	-36	37	40	60	35	50	14	-31	-58	-70	-42	-63	-48	-5
Biologist					46	75	-10	15	03	26	14	-29	-20	-21	-05	02	-18	21	04	-24	-69	-61	-32	-74	-76	-7
Architect						61	-15	-31	44	-04	36	17	-30	-51	-56	-56	-47	-15	-02	-19	-40	-16	-30	-22	-28	-1
Physicist							24	19	39	18	30	-02	-10	-28	-22	-33	-34	-19	24	11	-36	-17	-13	-54	-59	-5
Produc Mgr								59	35	25	27	07	38	25	32	-19	-02	-54	28	54	40	57	33	12	20	-0
Air Force Off									05	21	-06	-15	29	27	46	13	-11	-32	21	53	14	14	06	-29	-13	-4
Carpenter										41	78	68	34	-61	-56	-75	-67	-63	-11	30	19	41	31	16	-19	-04
For Serv Man											60	16	44	-20	02	-19	-29	-18	-19	07	-12	01	18	-16	-27	-21
Farmer												54	27	-61	-49	-75	-61	-52	-23	12	06	34	35	12	-11	00
Printer													38	-56	-60	-62	-63	-51	-19	31	44	37	38	33	15	21
Policeman														-09	01	-12	-15	-24	-25	15	31	30	34	32	08	03
Personnel Dir															82	72	70	31	38	11	15	02	-18	-10	28	00
Public Admin																65	59	23	26	09	01	-03	-11	-17	18	-12
Rehab Couns																	67	61	13	-21	-15	-40	-25	-21	-04	-14
School Supt																		61	17	-26	00	-14	-15	03	20	10

Table 6

Correlations Among 33 Men's Unique Scales

	Architect	Physicist	Produc Mgr	Air Force Off	Carpenter	For Serv Man	Farmer	Printer	Policeman	Personnel Dir	Public Admin	Rehab Couns	School Supt	Minister	CFA Owner	Senior CFA	Office Worker	Purch Agent	Pharmacist	Funeral Dir	Sales Mgr	Real Est Sales	Life Ins Sales	Advertising	Author-Journ	Pres-Mfg	Credit Mgr	am Comm Exec	Jmm Rec Admin
)	06	50	-03	11	14	54	31	-03	29	-39	-15	-13	-23	01	-32	-24	-39	-33	17	-19	-51	-42	-35	-37	-12	-42	-31	- -	-38
7	06	04	16	-07	53	56	73	39	40	-54	-38	-48	-41	-38	-41	-09	-02	23	53	30	-11	05	-04	-26	-21	-01	-11	-38	-15
)	00	27	-21	16	-56	-16	-53	-66	-36	37	40	60	35	50	14	-31	-58	-70	-42	-63	-48	-56	-38	-10	15	-34	-21	07	11
	46	75	-10	15	03	26	14	-29	-20	-21	-05	02	-18	21	04	-24	-69	-61	-32	-74	-76	-75	-67	-31	20	-38	-65	-52	-34
		61	-15	-31	44	-04	36	17	-30	-51	-56	-56	-47	-15	-02	-19	-40	-16	-30	-22	-28	-13	-24	27	57	12	-78	-60	-65
	24	19	39	18	30	-02	-10	-28	-22	-33	-34	-19	24	11	-36	-17	-13	-54	-59	-57	-62	-35	16	-03	-66	-76	-68		
		59	35	25	27	07	38	25	32	-19	-02	-54	28	54	40	57	33	12	20	-04	-23	-50	-54	41	32	-11	-09		
			05	21	-06	-15	29	27	46	13	-11	-32	21	53	14	14	06	-29	-13	-40	-53	-67	-65	-07	35	06	10		
				41	78	68	34	-61	-56	-75	-67	-63	-11	30	19	41	31	16	-14	-04	-30	-32	-21	19	-28	-70	-60		
					60	16	44	-20	02	-19	-29	-18	-19	07	-12	01	18	-16	-27	-21	-32	-48	-28	-13	-11	-38	-09		
						54	27	-61	-49	-75	-61	-52	-23	12	06	34	35	12	-11	00	-21	-31	-15	17	-31	-64	-45		
							38	-56	-60	-62	-63	-51	-19	31	44	37	38	33	15	21	05	-01	-08	09	-03	-32	-39		
								-09	01	-12	-15	-24	-25	15	31	30	34	32	08	03	05	-29	-34	-12	25	-02	12		
									82	72	70	31	38	11	15	02	-18	-10	28	00	08	-01	-18	20	53	61	47		
										65	59	23	26	09	01	-03	-11	-17	18	-12	-07	-22	-32	09	49	56	54		
											67	61	13	-21	-15	-40	-25	-21	-04	-14	09	02	-04	-25	36	61	60		
												61	17	-26	00	-14	-15	03	20	10	33	16	03	07	34	57	54		

Table 6 (continued)

Correlations Among 33 Men's Unique Scales

	CPA Owner	Senior CPA	Office Worker	Purch Agent	Pharmacist	Funeral Dir	Sales Mgr	Real Est Sales	Life Ins Sales	Advertising	Author-Journ	Pres-Mfg	Credit Mgr	Cham Comm Exec	Comm Rec Admin
Minister's	-13	-59	-43	-70	-49	-30	-22	-19	16	27	38	-39	-10	37	47
CPA Owner		54	29	17	-06	-16	10	-01	-09	-08	-08	31	14	-01	-25
Senior CPA			65	54	29	05	15	-03	-26	-44	-57	20	46	-09	-31
Office Worker				71	50	51	56	40	28	-08	-44	37	66	17	-03
Purch Agent					62	64	60	53	25	-08	-38	61	46	-03	-18
Pharmacist						59	33	23	15	-23	-45	32	37	-17	-12
Funeral Dir							66	70	66	30	-09	42	46	27	16
Sales Mgr								79	70	49	02	61	51	51	27
Real Est Sales									83	63	25	49	27	36	17
Life Ins Sales										71	38	30	25	50	37
Advertising											78	23	-18	34	10
Author-Journ												01	-62	-03	-15
Pres-Mfg													18	02	-18
Credit Mgr														64	50
Cham Comm Exec															82

Table 7

Correlation of 21 Men's Common Scales with 33 Men's Unique Scales

	Music Teach	Music Perf	Artist	Y Staff	Soc Sci Teach	Soc Worker	Psychologist	Librarian	Physician	Dentist	Chemist	Mathematician	Computer Prog	Math Sci Teach	Engineer	Army Officer	Lawyer	Accountant	Banker	Bus Ed Teacher	Phys Therapist
Osteopath	-30	04	24	-09	-29	-13	06	-23	77	63	41	09	17	24	17	12	-16	-30	-25	-33	65
Veterinarian	-26	-08	15	-16	-08	-45	-45	-55	33	67	12	-14	-20	18	14	-02	-34	-04	30	-04	35
Psychiatrist	10	16	07	10	-19	55	85	41	52	-12	28	30	40	-03	01	05	30	-44	-68	-33	26
Biologist	-24	16	47	-34	-64	-07	67	19	80	45	74	68	44	28	47	06	09	-37	-62	-72	29
Architect	-05	39	85	-63	-55	-48	23	25	38	55	54	65	-01	-15	48	-28	15	-22	-22	-72	-38
Physicist	-49	-04	49	-71	-80	-49	44	00	57	54	90	89	48	40	79	11	-01	00	-23	-65	-08
Produc Mgr	-59	-65	-41	-25	-32	-40	-24	-60	-19	05	28	02	43	40	52	58	-29	60	42	22	-02
Air Force Off	-56	-52	-50	03	-44	-07	11	-39	03	-12	36	-07	81	55	35	87	-34	35	-06	12	35
Carpenter	-46	-16	28	-62	-43	-81	-37	-41	02	63	37	24	02	35	54	06	-51	29	43	-14	-10
Forest Serv Man	-51	-30	01	-14	-24	-32	-18	-44	29	40	23	-02	10	30	33	30	-31	08	12	-07	41
Farmer	-45	-14	30	-49	-36	-78	-42	-54	18	68	33	15	-09	28	46	02	-41	15	36	-20	03
Printer	-19	07	17	-33	-03	-55	-49	-16	-21	42	01	-12	-19	22	09	-10	-43	33	45	08	-15
Policeman	-25	-20	-22	15	04	-20	-53	-44	-05	22	-01	-32	-02	24	02	30	-30	30	35	19	38
Personnel Dir	07	-33	-60	36	28	58	26	12	-37	-73	-31	-22	18	-13	-17	26	25	21	-04	41	-04
Public Admin	-07	-45	-63	40	16	53	26	-04	-20	-63	-19	-27	31	-02	-10	47	15	16	-12	31	19
Rehab Couns	34	-02	-42	58	41	85	45	33	-09	-68	-38	-23	07	-16	-45	10	25	-21	-34	32	23
School Supt	41	-08	-43	46	53	65	19	20	-24	-61	-43	-17	-17	-28	-40	-07	38	-06	-07	38	-02

Table 7 (continued)

Correlation of 21 Men's Common Scales with 33 Men's Unique Scales

	Music Teach	Music Perf	Artist	Y Staff	Soc Sci Teach	Soc Worker	Psychologist	Librarian	Physician	Dentist	Chemist	Mathematician	Computer Prog	Math Sci Teach	Engineer	Army Officer	Lawyer	Accountant	Banker	Bus Ed Teacher	Phys Therapist
Minister	64	49	08	47	59	73	39	62	17	-36	-29	00	-20	-36	-50	-30	40	-49	-55	-07	22
CPA Owner	-39	-43	-25	-30	-19	-12	20	08	-19	-21	18	33	28	16	36	10	24	52	18	10	-40
Senior CPA	-56	-61	-49	-34	-30	-43	-23	-29	-40	-07	16	01	45	53	40	45	-41	81	51	33	-20
Office Worker	-19	-42	-55	-04	26	-29	-60	-32	-71	-22	-31	-39	-09	22	-01	10	-35	78	74	64	-25
Purch Agent	-37	-58	-39	-21	05	-55	-68	-60	-60	-02	-15	-23	-14	13	24	13	-26	68	83	48	-40
Pharmacist	-31	-39	-29	-13	00	-38	-55	-60	-19	26	-06	-29	-16	27	13	02	-43	37	63	43	11
Funeral Dir	22	-11	-21	20	50	-15	-76	-33	-53	-06	-54	-52	-59	-29	-32	-22	-12	26	68	53	-19
Sales Mgr	20	-15	-32	25	47	01	-56	-19	-72	-39	-56	-54	-40	-39	-30	-07	18	34	52	53	-42
Real Est Sales	29	-03	-09	22	55	-03	-61	-13	-56	-23	-60	-42	-66	-54	-34	-32	32	15	52	40	-49
Life Ins Sales	5-	20	-04	44	72	22	-49	06	-43	-31	-67	-43	-71	-59	-58	-44	45	-05	33	38	-32
Advertising	62	53	41	19	43	-25	-08	49	-20	-19	-40	-11	-62	-77	-42	-59	62	-31	-06	-08	-51
Author-Journ	47	65	74	-06	09	14	24	61	25	10	04	37	-42	-62	-13	-54	71	-48	-36	-51	-43
Pres-Mfg	-15	-32	-09	-29	01	-33	-28	-31	-46	-09	-05	-02	-20	-21	29	-02	09	39	50	24	-55
Credit Mgr	01	-45	-87	47	44	27	-40	-25	-66	-58	-56	-71	04	07	-35	30	-28	53	47	82	12
Chamb Comm Exec	50	4	-51	81	64	72	-08	21	-47	-76	-72	-68	-12	-41	-73	14	27	-03	-07	52	05
Comm Rec Admin	43	07	-46	91	63	71	-10	-01	-23	-59	-66	-68	-11	-25	-72	16	-12	-23	-18	44	41